

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the above application.

The Office Action dated June 15, 2007, has been received and carefully reviewed. In that Office Action, an objection was raised in connection with the title. In addition, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 15, 16 and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimamura, claims 3, 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura, claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura in view of JP 2003-051872 to Iida, claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura in view of Kuroda, and claims 10, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura in view of Koizumi. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Two forms PTO SB/08 were attached to the June 15, 2007, Office Action. The form SB/08 date stamped March 30, 2006, by the PTO includes three references. However, the examiner's initials appear next to only two of the references. The third reference is not crossed out, and it appears that this reference should have been considered by the examiner. It is therefore respectfully requested that the examiner return a fully initialed copy of this form SB/08 with the next communication or, alternately, explain why U.S. 2005/0146621 was not considered.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The title was objected to for being insufficiently descriptive. By the above amendment, the title has been revised to further describe the present invention. The withdrawal of the objection to the title is therefore respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimamura. By the

above amendment, claim 1 has been revised to refer to a display device displaying a picture taken from the perspective of the camera. Figure 7 of Shimamura shows that a person viewing his image in mirror 11 will see an image from the perspective of a point below camera 23 which will be different than his image from the perspective of the camera. Claim 1 as amended is submitted to be allowable over Shimamura for at least this reason.

Claims 2-14 depend from claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimamura. Claim 15 recites a first display device including a display surface displaying a picture taken by said camera. The Office Action does not mention this limitation. No image taken by Shimamura's camera is displayed in Shimamura's mirror. Claim 15 is submitted to be allowable over Shimamura for at least this reason. If this rejection is not withdrawn, it is respectfully requested that the examiner explain how a reflection of an individual in a mirror is being interpreted as a "picture taken by a camera" so that the grounds for this rejection can be better understood.

Claims 16-20 depend from claim 15 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 15.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(b)

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over Shimamura. The Office Action acknowledges that Shimamura does not show a camera arranged on one side of laterally opposite sides of a display device, or that the optical axis of the camera is inclined toward the other side. However, at least partially based on Official Notice, the examiner finds that it would have been obvious to modify Shimamura to obtain the invention of claim 3.

Applicant acknowledges that cameras do not need to be located on the vertical centerline of an image pickup device. However, no reason has been provided for moving Shimamura's camera away from a vertical centreline. Even if Shimamura's camera were moved laterally, one skilled in the art would presumably move Shimamura's mirror 11 laterally as well to maintain the relationship shown in Shimamura's drawings. Nothing about Shimamura suggests, and no reason has been provided, that one skilled in the art would change the relationship of

Shimamura's mirror and Shimamura's camera. The statement "it would have been obvious ... to arrange the camera on a lateral side of the display as claimed" is conclusory, is not supported by the record, and does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness in connection with claim 3.

Moreover, the statement in the Office Action regarding "inclining a camera toward a user" is not understood. Claim 3 recites a relationship between a camera and a display. A user is not claimed, nor is a particular relationship between a user and an image pick-up device. The statement that it would have been obvious to incline a camera toward a user is submitted to be indefinite and does not provide support for finding the invention of claim 3 to be obvious. Claim 3 is submitted to be allowable over Shimamura for at least these reasons.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura. The Office Action takes Official Notice of the fact that some cell phones are "flip-style" and that some are formed of a single body. Applicant does not dispute these statements. However, nothing in the record suggests in any manner that the relationship between mirror and camera in Shimamura's flip-style phone would provide any advantage in a one-piece phone. The existence of single piece phones does not suggest the invention of claim 8, does not constitute a reason for making any modification to Shimamura, and does not constitute a prima facie case of obviousness. Claim 8 is submitted to be allowable for at least this reason.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura. Claim 17 is submitted to be allowable based on its dependency from claim 15 and for the reasons provided above in connection with claim 3.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura in view of JP 2003-51872 ("Iida"). Claim 9 depends from claim 1. Iida does not address the shortcomings of Shimamura discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claim 9 is therefore submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura in view of Kuroda. Claim 10 depends from claim 1. Kuroda does not address the shortcomings of Shimamura discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claim 10 is therefore submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Claims 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimamura in view of Koizumi. Claim 10 depends from claim 1. Koizumi does not address the shortcomings of Shimamura discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claim 10 is submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 10 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

CONCLUSION


Each issue raised in the Office Action dated June 15, 2007, has been addressed, and it is believed that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the examiner is respectfully requested to contact Scott Wakeman (Reg. No. 37,750) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  #37,750
Terrell C. Birch

Registration No.: 19,382
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant